REMARKS

The Applicants do not believe that examination of this response will result in the introduction of new matter into the present application for invention. Therefore, the Applicant, respectfully, requests that this response be entered in and that the claims to the present application, kindly, be reconsidered.

The Final Office Action dated June 16, 2004 has been received and considered by the Applicants. Claims 1-40 are pending in the present application for invention. Claims 1-19, 25 and 26 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 20-24 and 27-40 are rejected by the June 16, 2004 Final Office Action.

The drawings are objected to by the Final Office Action. Corrected red-lined drawings are submitted with this response

The Final Office Action rejects Claims 20-24 and 27-40 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0122601 A1 to Peng (hereinafter referred to as Peng). The Examiner states that Peng discloses all the recited elements of the rejected claims. The Examiner's position is that Peng teaches that the inverse discrete cosine transform in FIG. 4 of Peng (as described in section 28) is coupled to said controller and responsive thereto. The Applicant respectfully, disagree.

Claim 20 defines subject matter wherein at least one of said variable length decoder, inverse quantizer inverse discrete cosine transform and motion compensator is coupled to the controller and responsive thereto. Peng teaches a series of IDCT algorithms that are controlled by a lookup table and not the local resource controller as defined by the rejected claims to the present invention. FIG. 4 of Peng discloses a local resource controller that is not coupled to the IDCT algorithms but instead, the local resource controller of Peng is coupled to the complexity budget 30, which in turn is coupled to the lookup table, which in turn is coupled to the IDCT algorithms. Therefore, Peng does not disclose a controller that is coupled to the IDCT as asserted in the Final Office Action. Accordingly, all the features of rejected Claim 20 are not found in Peng. Therefore, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 21-24 and 27-31 depend from Claim 20, either directly or indirectly, and further narrow and define Claim 20. Therefore, Claims 21-24 and 27-31 are also believed to be allowable over the cited reference Peng.

The Applicants, respectfully, point out that although Claim 32 is listed as being rejected in the Office Action Summary (page 1 of paper number 16) there is no argument presented to support this rejection. Accordingly, absent an indication within the Final Office Action of where within the cited reference Peng the subject matter defined by rejected Claim 32 is found, the Applicants assume that Claim 32 is allowed, or at the very least, there is no bona fide rejection of Claim 32 contained within the Final Office Action. Alternatively, Claim 32 defines subject matter wherein at least one of said variable length decoder, inverse quantizer inverse discrete cosine transform and motion compensator is coupled to the controller and responsive thereto. Peng teaches a series of IDCT algorithms that are controlled by a lookup table and not the local resource controller as defined by the rejected claims to the present invention. FIG. 4 of Peng discloses a local resource controller that is not coupled to the IDCT algorithms but instead, the local resource controller of Peng is coupled to the complexity budget 30, which in turn is coupled to the lookup table, which in turn is coupled to the IDCT algorithms. Therefore, Peng does not disclose a controller that is coupled to the IDCT as asserted in the Final Office Action. Accordingly, all the features of rejected Claim 32 are not found in Peng. Therefore, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 33-40 depend from, either directly or indirectly, Claim 32 and further define Claim 32. Therefore, Claims 33-40 are also believed to be allowable.

Applicant is not aware of any additional patents, publications, or other information not previously submitted to the Patent and Trademark Office which would be required under 37 C.F.R. 1.99.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, with such allowance being, respectfully, requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

James D. Leimbach, Reg. 34,374
Patent Attorney (585) 381-9983

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted on this date via facsimile transmission to (703) 872-9306 AND addressed to:
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date of Transmission: September 9, 2004

_____

(Signature)

PAGE 15/23 * RCVD AT 10/27/2004 11:11:02 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/2 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:5853819983 * DURATION (mm-ss):05-54